

INTERESTING HISTORY.

Among the papers recently submitted by the President to Congress on Hawaiian affairs was the annexation treaty negotiated in 1854 between the representatives of the United States and King Kamehameha III, together with the correspondence relating thereto. That treaty provided for the cession to the United States of all territory, public buildings, property and revenues of the islands, and the incorporation of the islands into the Union as a state as soon as consistent, on a perfect equality with other states. The king of the islands and all his subjects were to continue in the enjoyment of all their existing personal and private rights, and to forever enjoy all the rights of citizenship in the United States on terms of perfect equality in all respects with other American citizens; all contracts incumbent upon the king's government were to be executed by the United States; the public lands were to be treated as part of the public domain of the United States, and the laws of the kingdom, so far as they were compatible with republican institutions, were to be temporarily retained. In consideration of the cession made and as compensation to all persons who might suffer loss thereby, the United States was to pay the sum of \$300,000 annually to the members of the royal family, the chiefs and other persons whom the king might wish to compensate or reward, and was further to pay the sum of \$75,000 a year for a term of ten years for the support of a college or university and of common schools.

The treaty was drafted by the United States minister, Mr. Gregg, and the king's cabinet. The signing of the treaty by the king was delayed on account of sickness and other reasons of one kind or another, and finally the king died towards the close of the year without signing the treaty. The new king, Kamehameha IV, as it turned out, was indisposed to give up the independent sovereignty of the islands, and finally the draft of the treaty submitted by the United States minister was disapproved by the secretary of state, who objected to the articles providing for the immediate incorporation of the islands into the United States as an independent state and fixing the amount of the annuities to be paid to the royal family and the chiefs.

One of the documents accompanying the proposed treaty was a letter of instructions, written by the secretary of state, Wm. L. Marcy, in which the secretary said:

In your general instructions you were furnished with the views of this government in regard to any change in the political affairs of the Sandwich Islands. The President was aware, when these instructions were prepared, that the question of transferring the sovereignty of those islands to the United States had been raised and favorably received by many influential individuals residing therein. It was foreseen that at some period not far distant such a change would take place, and that the Hawaiian Islands would come under the protectorate of or be transferred to some foreign power. You were informed that it was not the policy of the United States to accelerate such a change, but if, in the course of events, it became unavoidable, this government would much prefer to acquire the sovereignty of these islands

for the United States rather than to see it transferred to any other power. If any foreign connection is to be formed the geographical position of these islands indicates that it should be with us. Our commerce with them far exceeds that of all other countries. Our citizens have embarked in most important business concerns in that country, and some of them hold important positions. In view of the large American interests there established, and the intimate commercial relations existing at this time, it might well be regarded as the duty of this government to prevent the islands from becoming the appendage of any other foreign power.

No intimation has ever been given to this government as to the terms or conditions which will be likely to be annexed to the tender of the sovereignty. It is presumed, however, that something more than a mere protectorate is contemplated. A protectorate tendered to and accepted by the United States would not change the sovereignty of the country. In that case this government would take upon itself heavy and responsible duties, for which it hardly could expect compensating advantages.

I understand that the measure proposed by the people, and that in which the present rulers are disposed to concur, is annexation as distinguished from protection, and that it is their intention that these islands shall become a part of our territories and be under the control of this government as fully as any other of its territorial possessions. In any convention you may make it is expected that the rights to be acquired by the United States should be clearly defined.

Should the sovereignty of these islands be transferred to the United States, the present government would, as a matter of course, be superseded by, or at least be subjected to, the federal authority of this country.

In the convention you may make you are authorized to provide, in the amplest manner, for the security of individual property as held at the time of the transfer of the sovereignty, but the reservation of political rights or privileges in behalf of individuals would be inconsistent with the political power which it is proposed to vest in the United States.

I have good reason to believe that some of the leading powers of Europe would be very unwilling to see the Sandwich Islands become a part of the United States, and, if an opportunity occurred, would endeavor to defeat any negotiation for that purpose. This consideration and others make it important that you should bring it to a close as expeditiously as possible.

Secretary Marcy said, in his letter disapproving the treaty, that the United States would receive the transfer of the sovereignty of the islands, with all the usual and proper provisions relating to the existing rights and interests of the people, but would not go as far in the matter of annuities and incorporation as a state as the treaty provided.

This bit of diplomatic history is interesting as showing the views of an able statesman of his day on the policy of annexation as opposed to a protectorate for the islands, and the theory of preventing Hawaii from becoming an appendage of any government other than the United States. From present indications these views are shared by the foremost of our national leaders today.

SPEAKING OF Tammany, it is as well that those who want to keep on the good side of even a tiger should understand that the best side is outside.

REGARDING SUNDAY.

The question has been raised as to the correctness of the present orthography of the word "Sunday," the claim being made by some that it should be "Sonday." There are good grounds shown for this, too. It is recognized by all people of intelligent religious inclining as the Lord's day, as in truth all days are, but this is the one set apart specially for recognition of His dominion and grace. The Bible says, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," it thus appearing as His heritage—His day—the Son's day, which for the sake of euphony and convenience has been abbreviated to Sunday. Then why spell it otherwise than in consonance with its origin, particularly when by legitimate orthography the orthoepy of the word is not disturbed in the least?

In old English times the word was spelled "Sonneday" and in Germany it is oftener than otherwise found "Sohneday." It is known that the origin of the spelling which we have adopted is Phœnician and means the day set apart for the worship of the sun, just as Monday meant the day devoted to worshipping the moon; Tuesday was Tuisco's day, Wednesday Woden's, Thursday Thor's, Friday Friga's, and so on. All these names are so many relics of heathenism which our civilization has permitted to remain where they took hold of our etymological system, and some time or other they may all be disposed of and the Christian standard upheld.

An eastern paper, the New York Mail and Express, which was the first to start the discussion for the change, makes the point that our Hebrew fellow-citizens will concede that Messiah is the Son of God and the Son of David, and if any day of the week is to be named for Him, it is every way more appropriate to call it Sondag than Sunday. This can be granted by them, without their either affirming or denying that Christians are correct in considering Jesus to be Messiah. It is better for them, as well as the rest of the world, not to use the title Sunday, which is certainly of heathen import, for they, above all nations, never will worship the sun or any created thing. Also it shows that the Romanists ought to be glad to call the day after Jesus, for "Son of God" is the title which He most frequently applied to Himself after He ascended into heaven; and it would help to spiritualize their worship, the very thing in respect to which they stand in the greatest need.

It is understood that radical changes in any line of orthography now, when everything is so settled by usage and constant succession, is well nigh impracticable if not utterly so. This being the case, and the question of sanctity not entering into the matter as relates to any of the other days of the week, it might be as well to let the discussion end for the present with the propriety or otherwise of all Christian people and publications spelling it "Sonday" instead of longer recognizing the heathenism lingering around the present method. Some may say the matter is too trivial to justify general discussion or uniform action; but in a time when the tendencies are